Michael Saffle (Blacksburg, VA)

Liszt, Cultural Identity, Sonata Form, and the *Scherzo und Marsch*

Franz Liszt's cultural identity – which is to say, his identity as a regional or ethnic composer of Romantic music – is problematic. Liszt has several times been adopted by individuals seeking to foreground his native tongue (German), his ancestry (half German-speaking Austrian), or his ›nationality‹ – the last in either of two broad senses: that of ›Greater Germany‹ by way of Vienna and what today is the Austrian Burgenland; or that of ›cultural Germany‹ by way of Liszt's lessons with Czerny, his admiration for the works of Beethoven, Schubert, Wagner and other German artists, and his activities in and around Weimar especially between 1848 and 1861. Liszt probably spent more of his life in German-speaking Europe than anywhere else; his concert tours of German cities and states were perhaps his most extensive; and works by Bach, Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, Wagner and especially Beethoven were among the most profound influences on his own compositions. During the 1930s and 1940s Liszt was even linked, briefly and not very convincingly, with National Socialism, mostly insofar as he himself was Wagner's father-in-law and a devotee of Wagner's music-dramas, and insofar as portions of *Les Préludes* were employed by Nazi propagandists to provide Adolf Hitler with a ›Siegesfanfare‹ (or ›victory fanfare‹).[1] That Liszt was by no means altogether ›German‹, however, cannot be doubted. He was born in what then was Hungary and claimed that country as his native land; he spent substantial portions of his life in Italy and France; and he traveled widely and borrowed from a variety of musical sources and influences. Serge Gut has characterized Liszt as a »supranational« personality.[2] As a composer, however, Liszt mostly built upon specifically German musical traditions, especially those associated with Beethoven[3] and the ›Neudeutsche Schule‹ (or ›New German School‹) of the 1850s and 1860s.[4]

Liszt's mastery of sonata conventions ranks among his many musical accomplishments. His own Sonata in B minor, often identified as his masterpiece, has received more attention from performers and scholars than any of his other works.[5] Yet, although he published only

1 According to James Deaville in an unpublished paper »The Nazi Appropriation of Franz Liszt«. See: *Programme / Abstracts: 17th International Congress of the International Musicological Society*, Leuven 2002, p. 164.

2 Serge Gut, »Nationalism and Supranationalism«, in: *Liszt Society Journal* 19 (1994), p. 28–35.

3 See especially Axel Schröter, *»Der Name Beethoven ist heilig in der Kunst«: Studien zu Liszts Beethoven-Rezeption*, 2 vols. (= Musik und Musikanschauung im 19. Jahrhundert. Studien und Quellen 6), Sinzig 1999.

4 Among other studies of New German music and musicians, many of which foreground Wagner and / or music criticism, see: Robert Determann, *Begriff und Ästhetik der »Neudeutschen Schule«*, Baden-Baden 1989.

5 Among other important studies, see: Kenneth Hamilton, *Liszt: Sonata in B Minor*, Cambridge 1996; Michael Heinemann, *Franz Liszt: Klaviersonate h-Moll* (= Meisterwerke der Musik: Werkmonographien zur Musikgeschichte 61), Munich 1993; and Sharon Winklhofer, *Liszt's Sonata in B Minor: A Study of Autograph Sources and Documents* (= Studies in Musicology 29), Ann Arbor, MI 1980. Additional Liszt studies are identified in: Michael Saffle, *Franz Liszt: A Guide to Research*, New York ²2004, p. 368–374.

three pieces called »sonatas« (including the Duo Sonata for violin and piano and the so-called ›Dante Sonata‹ for solo piano), Liszt drew upon sonata conventions in dozens of compositions, including the *Faust* and *Dante* symphonies, many of the symphonic poems (*Tasso: Lamento e trionfo*, *Les Préludes*, and *Festklänge* among them), a number of piano pieces (including some of the operatic paraphrases), and certain choral and solo-vocal works. Liszt's imaginative and unconventional uses of sonata principles have never been fully explored. ›Sonata Idea‹ historian William Newman, for example, has maintained that the B-minor Sonata »stands alone« in terms of its sophisticated organizational scheme.[6] We shall see below, however, that at least one other Liszt work is organized along similar lines.

So many sonatas exist – sonatas long and short, trivial and profound; sonatas by so many composers, for so many different performing forces, and in so many variegated styles – that it is difficult to epitomize the genre's structural parameters. Nevertheless, for Liszt's contemporaries Beethoven's piano sonatas were generally considered exemplary. ›Departures‹ from the Master's practices were, and sometimes still are, considered ›exceptional‹. Even Carl Dahlhaus expressed a desire to »defend« Schubert against charges both that he stood »in Beethoven's shadow« and that the first movement of Schubert's op. 161 quartet tends simultaneously toward sonata and »variation cycle« rather than embodying unilaterally a »dialectically developmental« Beethovenian organizational scheme.[7] The truth is: not all sonatas are m e r e l y or o n l y sonatas, nor are all sonatas c a l l e d ›sonatas‹. The birth and exfoliation of the keyboard fantasy, sonata-fantasy and other forms during the early 19th century inspired a proliferation of innovative practices. At the same time, recipes for ›acceptable‹ sonata movements – Liszt derided such prescriptions as »formulae« rather than »forms«[8] – were entombed in dozens of pedagogical and analytical studies. Very few important works match these formulae precisely, a fact that continues to elude a great analysts and performers.

Whatever else it may be, a movement cast in sonata (or sonata-allegro) form is generally defined as possessing most or all of three features:

1. a bipartite ›I–V/X–I‹ harmonic structure,[9] in which the music modulations from the tonic to the dominant or other closely related key, explores new keys, then returns to and remains in the tonic key;

2. a three-part (exposition / development / recapitulation) or sometimes four-part (exposition / development / recapitulation / coda) sectional scheme; and

3. a ›principal‹ theme, first presented in the tonic, followed by a ›secondary‹ theme, first presented in the dominant, relative major, or other closely related key.

6 William S. Newman, *The Sonata Since Beethoven* (= A History of the Sonata Idea 3), New York ²1972, p. 134. Newman, it should be noted, restricted his discussion of the sonata almost exclusively to solo-keyboard works with the word »sonata« in their titles.

7 Carl Dahlhaus, »Sonata Form in Schubert: The First Movement of the G-Major String Quartet, Op. 161 (D 887)«, in: *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. by Walter Frisch, Lincoln, NE and London 1986, p. 1, 9.

8 See Liszt's letter to Louis Köhler of 9 July 1856. Quoted in: Hamilton, *Liszt: Sonata in B Minor*, p. 9.

9 As employed by Leonard Ratner in *Classical Music: Expression, Form and Style*, New York 1980, passim. Here ›X‹ refers to the harmonic instability of development sections ›in general‹.

Points 1 and 2 in no sense contradict each other; the first half of the ›I – V/X – I‹ scheme encompasses the exposition of a three-part sonata-form movement, while the second half comprises the development (›X‹) and recapitulation (›I‹). Point 3, on the other hand, is often irrelevant and even incorrect – although its gendered presence in a great many textbooks has given postmodern critics something to write about.[10] Many sonatas simply lack secondary themes. Consider: the monothematic sonata movement is a commonplace among Haydn's works; the use of a single theme in every movement of Schubert's Wanderer Fantasy is an important organizational principle; and the presence of three, four or five themes is commonplace in sonata-form *potpourris* and operatic overtures. The crux of ›sonata‹ is simply this: that material presented in a closely related key in the exposition returns in the home key in the recapitulation. On the other hand, 18th- and 19th-century multi-movement sonatas survive in which not a single movement is ›in‹ sonata form. Finally, as Newman has suggested, individual compositions may incorporate aspects of both single- and multiple-movement sonata conventions. Newman calls such conflations »double-function« forms.[11]

One of Liszt's most frequently overlooked or ignored single-movement sonatas, and one that incorporates aspects of double-function form, is the *Scherzo und Marsch*. In other words, like the B-minor Sonata, the *Scherzo und Marsch* can be heard both as a single-movement sonata form, complete with exposition, development, and recapitulation-coda, and as a three-movement composition. (See Table 1) These intertwined functions may not be immediately apparent, but the *Scherzo und Marsch* unquestionably possesses three principal sections, suggestive of movements; portions of those sections are expository, developmental, or recapitulatory in character; and material presented originally ›out of key‹ returns ›in key‹ before the movement ends. Note, for example, the transitional passages at mm. 172 – 199 and 419 – 442 that develop motifs (›x‹,›y‹ and ›M‹ – the last designates the principal march theme) presented earlier in D minor (= mm. 1 – 51). Note, too, the presence of two recapitulations: the first (mm. 292 – 387) remains in D minor, while the second (mm. 478 – 619) mirrors the work's opening measures. Finally, note both that motifs ›r‹, ›s‹, ›t‹ and so on appear originally in the dominant major (mm. 88 – 154), then reappear in the tonic (mm. 314 – 387); and that motif ›M‹ appears originally in the submediant major (mm. 388ff.), only to reappear in the tonic (mm. 567 – 574). The reprise of this last theme, introduced in the movement's principal development section, calls to mind the reappearance of the ›new‹ in the first-movement coda of Beethoven's *Eroica*.

Newman implies that a scheme of this kind is unique to Liszt's B-minor Sonata. Yet Liszt himself was by no means the first to employ it. Chopin's op. 49 Fantaisie is at once a single-movement sonata that suggests four separate movements by means both of a ›slow-movement‹ section that doubles as part of the work's development, and by martial passages that appear both in the exposition and recapitulation and suggest the presence of still an-

10 See, for example, Scott Burnham, »A. B. Marx and the Gendering of Sonata Form«, in: *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism*, ed. by Ian Bent, Cambridge and New York 1996, p. 163 – 186; and James Hepokowski, »Masculine-Feminine«, in: *MT* 135 (1994), p. 494 – 499.

11 Newman, *The Sonata Since Beethoven*, esp. p. 373. See, too, Rey M. Longyear, »Liszt's B Minor Sonata: Precedents for a Structural Analysis«, in: *MR* 34 (1973), p. 198 – 209.

Table 1: Franz Liszt, *Scherzo und Marsch*

measures	motifs	harmonic function	key(s)	smaller-scale structural units	Double-Function Implications: multi-movement form	Double-Function Implications: single-movement form
1–18	x	? (d minor)				
19–42	y					
43–51	z					
51–63	p					
63–76	q					
78–87	z_1	V	A major	exposition		
88–103	r					
104–115	s					
115–128	t					
128–154	coda	V	A major			
154–171	x_1		modulatory			
172–199	trans (y)				= FIRST	EXPOSITION
200–236	fugue (z)	vi	b minor	development	MOVEMENT	
236–250	u/v					
250–271	u_1/v_1					
271–291	coda		(toward d minor)			
292–302	p_1	i	d minor			
302–314	z					
314–329	r			recapitulation		
330–341	s					
331–353	t					
354–387	coda	i	d minor			
388–403	M	bVI = I	B-flat major	theme		
404–418	M_1	bIII	D-flat major			
419–442	$x_v + M_v$		modulatory		= MARCH	DEVELOPMENT
442–449	trans	I = bVI	B-flat major	(trio)		
450–461	M_2			theme		
462–477	coda		with B-flat pedal			
478–495	x	?	(d minor)			
496–519	y					
520–529	z	V	A major			
528–540	p			recapitulation 2		
540–553	q					
554–560	z_2		b-flat / b minor / D-flat		= FINALE	RECAPITULATION
560–566	u only		modulatory			
567–574	M_3	(i)	(d minor – modulatory)			
575–596	M_4	VI	B major	coda		
597–619	coda (t)	I	modulatory – D major			

other movement. Characteristic especially of Liszt's double-function works, however, is the use of fugal passages that suggest separate movements or sectional divisions. In the B-minor Sonata, for example, the fugal material functions both as developmental material and scherzo. In the *Scherzo und Marsch*, fugal material (mm. 200–236) functions primarily as a development of the ›z‹ motif within the work's ›first movement‹.

Unfortunately, the double-function model itself possesses certain weaknesses, especially when applied to the *Scherzo und Marsch*. First, the work in question contains so many motifs that listeners have trouble simply keeping track of them. Second, the work's showy passagework, rapid-fire tempos and complex textures make it difficult to perceive differences between ›scherzo / trio (march) / scherzo-coda‹ and ›exposition / development / recapitulation-coda‹ schemes. Nor is every aspect of the work's design self-evident even after careful examination.[12] Finally, Newman's double-function hypothesis is his own invention.[13] We do not know whether Liszt had anything like double-function in mind when he wrote this or any other piece of music. What we do know is that he was aware the work often ›failed‹ in performance.[14] The presence of a slower, ›second movement‹ section might have made the piece more enjoyable as well as more self-evidently double-functional.

In spite of all this, Liszt's experiments with single- and multi-movement sonata structures deserve to be recognized both as original and as devolving upon works by Beethoven and Schubert that Liszt himself performed or transcribed. Liszt, for example, seems to have drawn upon the last movement of Beethoven's 9. Symphony, with its transformations of a single tune into a ›Turkish march‹ and a ›fugue‹, in *Tasso* (with its minuet and martial conclusion) and the B-minor Sonata (with its fugal ›scherzo‹). In some of his operatic paraphrases, on the other hand, he seems to have drawn on the extravagant cadenzas and striking harmonic progressions of the Choral Fantasy, op. 80, and certain less familiar works for solo piano. Among his most straightforward and traditional ›sonatas‹, themselves exemplary of Beethoven's orchestral examples, are *Festklänge* and the first movement of the *Faust-Symphonie*. Finally, in such multi-movement sonata-form works as the E-flat Major Piano Concerto, he seems to have drawn on Schubert's Wanderer Fantasy and, perhaps, on Schumann's C-Major Fantasy.[15]

12 Even the B-minor Sonata's structural scheme seems uncertain. See: Alan Walker, »Serge Gut's ›Liszt‹«, in: *Journal of the American Liszt Society* 26 (1989), p. 44–48, which examines Gut's analysis of this work in single-movement terms. Other analyses suggest programmatic scheme; see, for example, Tibor Szász, *Liszt's Divine and Diabolical Symbolism: Key to the Religious Program in the Sonata in B Minor*, PhD Diss. University of Michigan 1985.

13 Newman admits that Liszt's contemporaries »may not have perceived« the double-function structure he himself postulates, although he implies that »many subsequent writers« have at least hinted at it (Newman, *The Sonata since Beethoven*, p. 373). Who those writers may have been Newman does not say.

14 See Leslie Howard's program notes for his superb recording of the *Scherzo und Marsch*, distributed as *Liszt: Dances and Marches* (= Liszt: The Complete Music for Solo Piano 28), Hyperion CDA66811/2 (1994).

15 With regard to sonata form in several of Liszt's symphonic poems, see: Keith T. Johns, *The Symphonic Poems of Franz Liszt* (= Franz Liszt Studies Series 3), Stuyvesant, NY 1996, passim. With regard to *Festklänge*, see: Saffle, »Liszt's Use of Sonata Form: The Case of ›Festklänge‹«, in: *Liszt 2000: Selected Lectures Given at the International Liszt Conference in Budapest, May 18–20, 1999*, ed. by Klára Hamburger, Budapest 2000, p. 201–216. With regard to Liszt and the keyboard fantasy, see: Saffle, »Liszt and the

Which brings us, once again, to Liszt and cultural identity. The German tradition that proclaimed Beethoven the *sine qua non* of composers also proclaimed the superiority of ›absolute‹ instrumental music – a »conception of musical autonomy« that eventually grew into a »powerful philosophical assertion« by »an elite« 19th-century intelligentsia conscious of »its own unique achievement and status«.[16] In other words, sonatas and other ›absolute‹ German instrumental works gradually acquired cultural hegemony over European art music as a whole. Unhappily, Liszt was often excluded from the pantheon of canonical masters proclaimed by the Leipzig Conservatory and other academies of Romantic musical learning. Instead, he was embraced as the leader of the New German School not only because of his own efforts, but because he was perceived as a ›programmatic‹ composer, a creator of ›formless‹ works. His penchant for descriptive titles, his fondness for extra-musical references, and his efforts on behalf of Berlioz, Cornelius, Wagner and others who specialized in vocal and dramatic works were frequently construed as ›anti-Beethovenian‹ and, thus, as ›anti-German‹. Finally, Liszt proclaimed himself ›Hungarian‹, even as many of his critics epitomized him and his music as ›French‹ or ›Catholic‹. I do not mean to imply that Liszt was not a Hungarian patriot, or that his compositions do not embody important French, Italian and religious influences. The fact remains, however, that Liszt was one of the most important exemplars of the Beethovenian – the G e r m a n – compositional tradition. Like other of his masterpieces, the *Scherzo und Marsch* exemplifies this fact in terms of its structural transformations of Beethoven and post-Beethovenian sonata conventions.

Eva Verena Schmid (Mainz und Stuttgart)

Die Bedeutung des Chorals auf Musikfesten in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts

Musikfeste werden in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts als Kultur- und – unter diesem Deckmantel – auch als Nationalfeste gefeiert.[1] Die Hauptanliegen dieses Aufführungsforums – die ›Beförderung der Tonkunst‹ und die Schaffung eines Gemeinschafts- bzw. Nationalgefühls – vereinigen sich wie in einem Brennpunkt in der Gattung Choral, die wohl aus diesem Grund eine omnipräsente Gattung auf Musikfesten war. In den unterschiedlichsten Gestalten – vokal, instrumental, als alleinstehende Gattung, innerhalb an-

Traditions of the Keyboard Fantasy«, in: *Liszt the Progressive*, ed. by Hans Kagebeck and Johan Lagerfelt (= Studies in the History and Interpretation of Music 72), Lewiston, NY 2001, p. 151–185.

16 Gary Tomlinson, »Musicology, Anthropology, History«, in: *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*, ed. by Martin Clayton e. a., New York and London 2003, p. 21–38, here: p. 38.

1 Vgl. Eva Verena Schmid: *Oratorium und Musikfest. Zur Geschichte des Oratoriums in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Diss. Universität der Künste in Berlin 2008.